Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
10-295 JUN 15 2010
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JAMES B. VEASAW - PETITIONER

Vs.

UNITED STATES,
Christopher Cox Chairman,
Unites States Securities and Exchanged Commission
- RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM
UNITED STATES FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JAMES B. VEASAW
1511 Walnut Lane
Humble , TX, 77339

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

NOTICE: FAILURE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO HEAR THIS CASE WILL RESULT IN ABROGATION THE UNITED STATES COURTS AUTHORITY IN THESE MATTERS, AS ALLOWED FOR UNDER THE NINTH and TENTH AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

OATHS

DOES THE 28 U.S.C. § 453 OATH RELEVANT OR ARE THEY JUST WORDS TO PACIFY THE PEASANTS ?

STARE DECISIS

DO WE THE PEOPLE within the court STILL ABIDE BY AND/OR ADHERE TO PREVIOUSLY DECIDED CASES ?

DISABILITIES (THE DISABLED)

The plaintiff should have won this case many times over if it was for all the fraud and corruption in the government and courts.

1) ARE PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES ALLOWED TO PARTICIPATE IN OUR LEGAL SYSTEM, WITHIN THE SAME TIME LIMITS ALLOWED OTHERS ?

LEARNING DISABILITIES

The plaintiff has numerous documented learning disabilities (listen speaking reading writing, math , dyslexia).

1) DO PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES, AND WITHOUT AN ATTORNEY ENTITLED TO FAIR DUE PROCESS ?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED (Cont.)

DUE PROCESS (H-08-2936)

If facts show reason for dismissal were not EVIDENT and the case was dismissed for such reasons A) statute of limitations , B) res-judicata were fraudulent ?

1) DO WE STILL HAVE DUE PROCESS IN THIS COUNTRY (USA) ?
2) WHERE IS DUE PROCESS (08-2936 / 09-20593) ?

PRIVACY ACT

1) HOW DOES ONE GET FAIR DUE PROCESS FOR A VIOLATION OF THE PRIVACY ACT?
2) ARE THERE ANY (STATUTES) LIMITS TO THE DAMAGES FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE PRIVACY ACT ?

STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS

1) WHAT ARE THE STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS FOR THE PRIVACY ACT ?
2) WHAT ARE THE STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY THE COURT ?
3) WHAT ARE THE STATUTES OF LIMITATION FOR TREASON ?
4) WHAT ARE THE STATUTES OF LIMITATION FOR MISPRISION OF TREASON ?

RES-JUDICATA

1) WHAT ARE THE ELEMENTS FOR RULING OF RES-JUDICATA ?
2) IS IT POSSIBLE TO HAVE RES-JUDICATA WITHOUT HAVING FUELLED ALL ELEMENT OF RES-JUDICATA ?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED (Cont.)

JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

1) WHAT IS A COURT OF COMPETENT JURISDICTION?
2) MUST THAT COURT DO TO ESTABLISH JURISDICTION?
3) MUST THAT COURT HEAR THE MERITS?
4) WHAT IF THE COURT RULES IT

DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION AND/OR THE PLAINTIFF HAD NOT MERIT and/or ACTIVITIES WERE NOT ACTIONABLE, WAS THERE ANY DUE PROCESS FOR THOSE ACTIVITIES DENIED TO BE HEARD ?

APPEAL

1) `WHAT IS AN APPEAL?
2) WHAT ARE THE ELEMENTS OF AN APPEAL?
3) WHY WOULD ONE APPEAL TO A HIGHER COURT?

FACTS

1) DO FACTS HAVE ANY BEARING ON WHO GETS FAIR DUE PROCESS?
2) DO FACTS HAVE ANY BEARING ON THE OUTCOME OF A CASE?
3) DO FACT HAVE AN OUTCOME ON A APPEAL?

MISPRISION OF TREASON

1) WHAT IS THE STANDARD FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW?
2) AT WHAT POINT MUST A JUDGE HEAR A CASE THAT ATTEMPTS TO COMPLY WITH 18 U.S.C. 2382 MISPRISION OF TREASON?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED (Cont.)

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

During the appeal process, the defendant representative attacked what was said in the plaintiffs prayer.

1) DO WE STILL HAVE FREEDOM OF RELIGION IN THESE COUNTRY?

SECURITIES and EXCHANGE COMMISSION / GOVERNMENT FRAUD

1) IS THERE ANY DUE PROCESS PROTECTION AFFORDED TO THE PLAINTIFF IN THESE COURTS FROM GOVERNMENT FRAUD AGAINST THE PLAINTIFF?

TREASON

1) WHAT CONSTITUTES TREASON?
2) FAILURE TO REPORT TREASON?
3) NONFEASANCE OF TREASON?
4) ARE THOSE IN OUR OWN GOVERNMENT IMMUNE TO COMMIT TREASON AGAINST THE PEOPLE?

The PETITIONER understands that a FOREIGN CITIZENS CAN NOT be tried with treason (USA). The Petitioner is aware that the Federal government has special needs for INTERPRETERS, and maybe some other jobs that just can't be done by an AMERICAN CITIZEN.

5) IF SO, is it appropriate (legal) for a FOREIGN CITIZEN who must take a OATH (ALLEGIANCE TO THE US CONSTITUTION)for a FEDERAL JOB, and when it is possible they could be NEFARIOUSLY used to OVER THROUGH the UNITED STATES?
6) Should there be any special justification (rules / laws) to hire a FOREIGNER over an AMERICAN when there is an AMERICAN CITIZEN who is perfectly capable of doing the same job?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED (Cont.)

DEFINITIONS FOR ENGLISH (WORDS) USED IN COURT

1) IS BLACKS LAW DICTIONARY SUFFICIENT ENGLISH FOR THE FEDERAL COURTS?
2) IS WEBSTER'S dictionary SUFFICIENT ENGLISH FOR THE FEDERAL COURTS?

GREATER IMPORTANCE TO A NATION since 08/02/06

Given 20/20 HINDSIGHT and looking back on the Collapse / Bankruptcy of Bear Stearns, Leaman Brothers, AIG, Merrill Lynch, Freedie Mac, Fannie Mae the DECADE of WARNING from MARCPOLOS about 50 billion dollar Bernie Madoff PONZI SCHEME, 700 billion dollar banker bailout / TARP, car companies bailout, 15 minute 1000 point drop in DOW INDUSTRIAL Average,

1) WHAT CASE HAD A GREATER IMPORTANCE ON AMERICAN SOCIETY;

"Bong Hits 4 Jesus"

Morse v. Frederick, 06-278.

(The case the US Supreme Court decided to Hear)

or

" GOVERNMENT (SEC) CORRUPTION"

Veasaw v. Dominguez, wt al., 05-1467

(The case the US Supreme Court decided NOT to Hear)?

FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY THE COURT

In a case where FRAUD and OTHER CRIMES that were committed against the Plaintiff by government employees at the U.S. S.E.C., and were DOCUMENTED by the Plaintiff, and then IGNORED by the court, AND IF A CASE IS SEPARATED (from 1 to 6) by the COURT, and the Court then returns ALL 6 of the MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATIONS of ALL 6 SEPARATED CASES that were issued on the same day,

AND NOT AS THEY WERE WRITTEN;
AND RETURNED IN THE SAME ENVELOPE

so that ALL 6 cases of the SEPARATED CASE (H-03-3878), so that the plaintiff is forced to responded to ALL 6 SEPARATED CASES within the SAME DEADLINE PERIOD of ALL 6 SEPARATE CASES, where by the plaintiffs RESPONSE to one case INTERFERES with the DEADLINE to RESPOND to one or more the other FIVE SEPARATE CASES; in other words the case (H-03-3878) was never really FAIRLY SEPARATED INTO SIX SEPARATED CASES; and given that scenario.

1) HAS THE COURT COMMITTED
A FRAUD UPON THE COURT
by it's interfering with judicial process
(issuing ALL 6 CASES at the same time knowing the Plaintiff LEARNING DISABILITIES and that fraud other CRIMES were committed against the plaintiff by the by government employees, and documented by the plaintiff) ?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED (Cont.)

QUESTIONS ORIGINALLY SUBMITTED 05-1467
(NOW BEING RESUBMITTED) (as they are still being relevant to day as they were back in 2005

1) Are State and Federal Employees IMMUNE to commit CRIMES against the PEOPLE in order to GAIN the upper hand in a Court Case or administrative investigation and/or Process , without any fear of RETRIBUTION in the COURTS?

2) Are FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS accessible by All Citizen for whom the programs were designed for, or are they just really WORK PROGRAMS designed to give CRONIES and BUREAUCRATS high paying Jobs?

3) Must the citizens of this country PASS LITERARY TESTS in order to receive PROTECTION in the COURTS (i.e. say the "MAGIC WORDS" for justice) (i.e. put the "MAGIC WORDS" on " MAGIC PAPER ") ?

4) Are theses laws CONSTITUTIONAL, If these laws are not EQUALLY apply to ALL (STATE, FEDERAL, CORPORATE)?

5) I think , (ARE) ALL of you CORRUPT ?

6) CAN THE PETITIONER GET MORE JUSTICE WITH A $10 BOX OF AMMO, THAN WHAT CAN EVER BE FOUND IN ALL THE CORRUPT UNITED STATES COURT ROOMS.?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED (Cont.)

REVOLUTION - HISTORY

In College I was befriended by a retired
SECTION CHIEF for the CIA (if that is possible).
SOME MAY RECOGNIZE HIM,
NOT KNOWING HIS NAME,
ON ROOF by the STAIR CASE IN VIETNAM
Where he HELPED PEOPLE get on the Helicopters
APRIL 30, 1975.
http://gregdooley.com/gallery/gal_lasthuey.html

That Staircase of from HISTORY is now in the
GERARD FORD MUSEUM,
http://www.ford.utexas.edu/LIBRARY/SPEECHES/990410.asp

http://www.mlive.com/news/grand-rapids/index.ssf/2009/05/former_vietnamese_refugee_visi.html

Some people know the man
As just as just mean...
The Greatest Story never told.
CBS NEWS , by Bob SIMON
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2000/04/25/world/main188372.shtml?tag=mncol;lst;1

QUESTIONS PRESENTED (Cont.)

==========

For the last 20 years the plaintiff has VOLUNTEERED as a MILITARY ANALYST when it was ILLEGAL for the CIA to operate in this country. The Plaintiff job was to

" THINK OF THE UNTHINKABLE "

How to destroy this country,

How to WIN a BATTLE, how to find a better way....etc

THREAD THE NEEDLE, SLICE AND DICE, ...etc

because if I and other like me could think of it, so could our enemies. This allowed OUR COUNTRY TO BE SECURE. BUT I NEVER TELL ALL, I ALWAYS HELD SOMETHING BACK, SOME GEMS I WOULD NOT EVEN TELL THE PRESIDENT

(They could not be trusted)...!

1) HOW LONG DOES THIS COURT THINK THAT IT WILL CONTINUE TO DENY THE PEOPLE (PLAINTIFF) DUE PROCESS AND COVER-UP THE

<u>GOVERNMENT TREASON</u> AND
<u>GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION</u>

BEFORE THE PEOPLE TO FINALLY RISE UP AND REVOLT AGAINST <u>A CORRUPT GOVERNMENT</u> and TAKE BACK <u>"" OUR "</u> COUNTRY FROM THOSE WE ENTRUSTED TO PRESERVE OUR RIGHTS ?

LIST OF PARTIES

All Parties DO appear in the caption of the case cover. A list of all parties to the proceedings in the court whose judgement is the subject of this petition is as follows:

JAMES B. VEASAW ,
PETITIONER

Vs.

UNITED STATES,
Christopher Cox Chairman,
Unites States Securities and Exchanged Commission,
RESPONDENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED ..... i- ix
LIST OF PARTIES x
TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... xi - xii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... xii -xiv
TABLE TO APPENDICES A ..... xv - xvii
TABLE TO APPENDICES B (AUTHORITIES) ..... xvii - xix
INTRODUCTION ..... 1 - 3
OPINIONS BELOW 3
JURISDICTION 4
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 5
STATEMENT OF THE CASE 6
ISSUES IN THIS CASE H-082936 7
OUTLINE KEY POINTS 8
KEY DATES
1) CASE H-03-3878 9
2) CASE 05-20312 10
3) CASE 05-1467 10
4) CASE H-08-2936 11
5) CASE 09-20593 11
6) CASE 09- ? ? ? (1149) 11
7) BOTTOM LINE THE DISTRICT COURT 12
8) PLAINTIFF REBUTTAL 12
9) REBUTTAL OF H-09-2936 MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATIONS 13
10) THE EXTENT OF THE GOVERNMENT and COURTS CORRUPTION FRAUD (UP)ON THE COURT BY THE COURT ..... 14 - 16
11) FRAUD(UP)ON THE COURT BY THE COURT 1 17
12) QUALIFICATIONS OF PLAINTIFF 17
13) THE 5TH CIRCUIT COURT LEVEL 18
14) FRAUD (UP)ON THE COURT BY THE COURT 2 SEPARATION and PROCESSING of H-08-3878 ..... 19 - 20

15) PRIVACY ACT WILLFULLY AND/OR INTENTIONALLY VIOLATION 21
16) CASE 05-1467 (Questions presented)..... 22
17) CASE 05-1467 v. 06-278 23
18) WITH A LITTLE 20/20 HIND SIGHT 23
TREASON 24
18 U.S.C. § 2382. Misprision of treason
REASON FOR GRANTING WRIT 25
STARE DECISIS..... 25
CONCLUSION 30
SIGNATURE 31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

========== PAGE
16 AM Jur 2d, Sec 177 late 2d, Sec 256..... 25
135 U.S. 1 In re Neagle [*]..... 25
522 U.S. 192, 118 S.Ct. 542, 139 L.Ed.2d 553 (1997)..... x
ARTICLE III Section 3 (U.S. CONSTITUTION)..... x
Amendment [V.] (U.S. CONSTITUTION)..... x
Amendment [IX.] (U.S. CONSTITUTION)..... x
Amendment [X.] (U.S. CONSTITUTION)..... x
Amendment [XIV.] (U.S. CONSTITUTION)..... x
Bay Area Laundry And Dry Cleaning Pension Trust Fund v. Ferbar Corporation Of California, Inc. 522 U.S. 192, 118 S. Ct. 542, 139 L. Ed. 2d 553 (1997) 27
Beck v. Prupis (98-1480) 529 U.S. 494 (2000) 162 F.3d 1090, affirmed. x
Chambers V. Nasco, Inc. ,501 U.S. 32, 111 S.Ct. 2123, 115 L.Ed.2d 27..... x
Clark v. Iowa City, 87 U.S. 20 Wall. 583 583 (1874)..... 27
Clay v. Johns-Manville Sales corp., 722 F.2d 1289 (6th Cir. 1983 -1984)..... 27
Demjanjuk v. Petrovsky, 10 F.3d 338 (6th Cir. 1993) 27
Doe v. Chao, Secretary of Labor 540 U.S. 614 (2004) 26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (CONT.)

Doe v. Chao, Secretary of Labor 435 F.3d 492 (4th Cir. 2006) 26

Frame v. City of Arlington, No. 08-10630 (5th Cir. 2009)..... 27

Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co. 322 U.S. 238, 64 S.Ct. 997, 88 L.Ed. 1250 (1944)..... 27

Herring v. United States of America., 424 F.3d 384 (3rd Cir. 2005) 28

Hodge v. Service Machine Company , 438 F.2d 347 (6th Cir 1971) 27

Irwin v. Dept. of Veterans Affairs, 498 U.S. 89, 111 S.Ct. 453, 112 L.Ed.2d 435 (1990) 28

Johnson v. Dept. of Treasury, 700 F.2d 971 (5th Cir. 1983)..... 26

Marbury v. Madison, 5 US (2 Cranch) 137, 174, 176, (1803) 25

Maydak v. United States, 363 F.3d 512 (DC Cir. 2004)..... 26

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 US 436 p. 491 25

McDaniel v. Anheuser-Bush, Inc., 987 F.2d 298,304 n. 19 (5th Cir. 1993)..... x

Nagle v. Lee , 807 F.2d 435, 439 (5th Cir. 1987)..... 26

National Railroad Passenger Corporation v. Morgan., 536 U.S. 101 (2002) 28

Norton v. Shelby County 118 US 425 p.442 29

Orekoya v. Mooney, 330 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2003) 26

Pfizer , Inc. v.. International Rectifier Corp. , 190 U.S.P.Q. 273 (8th Cir. 1976)..... x

Rawlings v. Ray, 312 U.S. 96 (1941) x

Reiter v. Cooper, 507 U.S. 258, 113 S.Ct. 1213, 122 L.Ed.2d 604 (1993)..... x

Rivet v. Regions Bank of Louisiana,522 U.S. 470, 118 S.Ct. 921, 139 L.Ed. 2d 913 (1998) 28

Securities & Exchange Commission v. ESM Group, INC.,835 F.2d 270 (11th Cir. 1988) 28
Sinochem Int'l Co. v. Malaysia Int'l Shipping Corp., 549 U. S._ (2007) 28
Sosa v. Alvarez-Machain (03-339) 542 U.S. 692 (2004), 331 F.3d 604, reversed. x
Steel Company v. Citizens For A Better Environment, 523 U.S. 83 (1998) 28
Swift v. Swift, 129 F.3d 792 (5th Cir. 1997) 29
Travelers Indemnity Company v. Gore, 761 F.2d 1549 (11th Cir. 1985) 30
TRW Inc. v. Andrews, 534 U.S. 19, 122 S.Ct. 441, 151 L.Ed.2d 339 (2001) 29
United States v. Ratcliff, 488 F.3d 639 (5th Cir. 2007) .....
Woodruff v. Tomlin, 511 F.2d 1019 (6th 1975) 29

THOSE CASES WITHOUT PAGE NUMBER (x) WERE TAKEN OUT OF THE ORIGINAL PETITION TEXT TO GET THE WORD COUNT UNDER 9000 WORDS.

The Plaintiff does not have TIME or ABILITY TO DO THIS PETITION RIGHT, BUT ONLY TO THE BEST OF MY LITERARY ABILITIES

STATUTES

5 U.S.C § 552a (g)(1)
18 U.S.C.§ 2381. Treason
18 U.S.C.§ 2382. Misprision of treason
18 U.S.C.§ 2384. Seditious conspiracy
18 U.S.C.§ 2383. Rebellion or insurrection
18 U.S.C. § 2385. Advocating overthrow of Government
18 U.S.C.§ 2441. War crimes.

TABLE OF APPENDICES A

========== PAGE

May 12, 2009 Memorandum and Order (H-08-2936)
APPENDIX 1A 1a- 8a

May 12, 2009 Final judgement (H-08-2936)
APPENDIX 2A 9a

Jan,. 20 2010 5th. Cir Court Appeal Denial (No. 09-20593)
.APPENDIX 3A 10a

Jan. 20, 2010 5th Cir. Denial EN BANC (No. 09-20593)
APPENDIX 4A 11a- 12a

NOTE BY PLAINTIFF OF FRAUD APPENDIX 5A 13a

Feb 4, 2004 Orders SEPARATION (H-03-3878) 1 to 6
APPENDIX 6A ..... (FRAUD) 14a - 15a

==========

DEC 17, 2004 Memorandum and Recommendation
APPENDIX 7A (H-03-3878)(FRAUD) 16a–25a

DEC 17, 2004 Memorandum and Recommendation)
APPENDIX 8A (H-04-66) (FRAUD) 26a

DEC 17, 2004 Memorandum and Recommendation
APPENDIX 9A (H-04-67) (FRAUD) 27a

DEC 17, 2004 Memorandum and Recommendation
APPENDIX 10A (H-04-68) (FRAUD) 28a

DEC 17, 2004 Memorandum and Recommendation
APPENDIX 11A (H-04-69) (FRAUD) 29a

Dec. 17, 2004 Memorandum and Recommendation
APPENDIX 12A (H-04-70) (FRAUD) 30a

Feb 4, 2005 Dismissal Order (H-03-3978)
APPENDIX 13A (FRAUD) 31a

Feb 4, 2005 Dismissal Order (H-04-766)
APPENDIX 14A (FRAUD) 32a

Feb 4, 2005 Dismissal Order (H-04-67)
APPENDIX 15A (FRAUD) 33a

Feb 4, 2005 Dismissal Order (H-04-68)
APPENDIX 16A (FRAUD) 34a - 35a

Feb 4, 2005 Dismissal Order ((H-04-69) (not delivered)
APPENDIX 17A (FRAUD) 36a

TABLE OF APPENDICES A (cont.)

		PAGE
Feb 4, 2005	Dismissal Order (H-04-70)	
	APPENDIX 18A (FRAUD)	37a
Feb 4, 2005	FINAL JUDGEMENT (H-03-3878)	
	APPENDIX 19A (FRAUD)	38a
Feb 4, 2005	FINAL JUDGEMENT (H-04-66)	
	APPENDIX 20A (FRAUD)	39a
Feb 4, 2005	FINAL JUDGEMENT (H-04-67)	
	APPENDIX 21A (FRAUD)	40a
Feb 4, 2005	FINAL JUDGEMENT (H-04-68)	
	APPENDIX 22A (FRAUD)	41a
Feb 4, 2005	FINAL JUDGEMENT (H-04-69)	
	APPENDIX 23A (FRAUD)	42a
Feb 4, 2005	FINAL JUDGEMENT (H-04-70)	
	APPENDIX 24A (FRAUD)	43a
Oct 2, 2006	Notice by U.S. Supreme Court Petition denied	
	APPENDIX 25	44a
	GLOSSARY DEFINITIONS	
	APPENDIX 26	45a – 51a
Nov, 5, 1997	Rehabilitation act era document of disabilities	
	APPENDIX 27	52a
	April Gallop lawsuit	
	Item # 34 Excerpt 9-11 Pentagon employee	
	APPENDIX 28	53a
Apr. 21 2009	Growing body (dead) body count of OKC	
	Bombing witnesses who knew too much	
	APPENDIX 29	54a-60a
Apr. 21 2009	Transcript of Hurrah Fed. building Survivor	
	APPENDIX 30	61a- 65a
LAWS	, § 2381., § 2382. § 2383.,§ 2384.	66a-73a
1974	Privacy act Excepts	
	APPENDIX 31	61a- 65a
	Judges Cannon	
	APPENDIX 32	61a- 65a

TABLE OF APPENDICES A (cont.)

PAGE

§ 2385. Advocating overthrow of Government
§ 2441. War crimes (OKC -/ 9-11 MURDER)
APPENDIX 31A 71a-73a
1974 THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974 (excerpts)
5 U.S.C. § 552a
APPENDIX 32A ..... 74a –79a

TABLE OF APPENDICES B

PAGE

16 AM Jur 2d, Sec 177 late 2d, Sec 256. 1
135 U.S. 1 In re Neagle [*]..... 1
522 U.S. 192, 118 S.Ct. 542, 139 L.Ed.2d 553 (1997)..... x
ARTICLE III Section 3 (U.S. CONSTITUTION)..... x
Amendment [V.] (U.S. CONSTITUTION)..... x
Amendment [IX.] (U.S. CONSTITUTION)..... x
Amendment [X.] (U.S. CONSTITUTION)..... x
Amendment [XIV.] (U.S. CONSTITUTION)..... x
Bay Area Laundry And Dry Cleaning Pension Trust Fund v. Ferbar Corporation Of California, Inc. , 522 U.S. 192, 118 S.Ct 542, 139 L.Ed.2d 553 (1997)..... 2
Beck v. Prupis (98-1480) 529 U.S. 494 (2000) 162 F.3d 1090, affirmed. 3
Chambers V. Nasco, Inc. ,501 U.S. 32, 111 S.Ct. 2123, 115 L.Ed.2d 27..... 3
Clark v. Iowa City, 87 U.S. 20 Wall. 583 583 (1874)..... 3
Clay v. Johns-Manville Sales corp., 722 F.2d 1289 (6th Cir. 1983 -1984)..... 4
Demjanjuk v. Petrovsky, 10 F.3d 338 (6th Cir. 1993)..... 5
Doe v. Chao, Secretary of Labor 540 U.S. 614 (2004)..... 5
Doe v. Chao, Secretary of Labor 435 F.3d 492 (4th Cir. 2006) 6
Frame v. City of Arlington, No. 08-10630 (5th Cir. 2009)..... 7- 8

TABLE OF APPENDICES B

========== PAGE

Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co. 322 U.S. 238, 64 S.Ct. 997, 88 L.Ed. 1250 (1944) 8

Herring v. United States of America., 424 F.3d 384 (3rd Cir. 2005) 9

Hodge v. Service Machine Company , 438 F.2d 347 (6th Cir 1971) 10

Irwin v. Dept. of Veterans Affairs, 498 U.S. 89, 111 S.Ct. 453, 112 L.Ed.2d 435 (1990) 10-11

Johnson v. Dept. of Treasury, 700 F.2d 971 (5th Cir. 1983) 11

Marbury v. Madison, 5 US (2 Cranch) 137, 174, 176, (1803) 11

Maydak v. United States, 363 F.3d 512 (DC Cir. 2004) 12

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 US 436 p. 491 ..... 1&12

McDaniel v. Anheuser-Bush, Inc., 987 F.2d 298,304 n. 19 (5th Cir. 1993)..... 12

Nagle v. Lee , 807 F.2d 435, 439 (5th Cir. 1987) 12

National Railroad Passenger Corporation v. Morgan., 536 U.S. 101 (2002) 13

Norton v. Shelby County 118 US 425 p.442 13

Orekoya v. Mooney, 330 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2003) 14

Pfizer , Inc. v.. International Rectifier Corp. , 190 U.S.P.Q. 273 (8th Cir. 1976) 14-15

Rawlings v. Ray, 312 U.S. 96 (1941) 15

Reiter v. Cooper, 507 U.S. 258, 113 S.Ct. 1213, 122 L.Ed.2d 604 (1993) 16

Rivet v. Regions Bank of Louisiana,522 U.S. 470, 118 S.Ct. 921, 139 L.Ed. 2d 913 (1998) 16-17

Securities & Exchange Commission v. ESM Group, INC.,835 F.2d 270 (11th Cir. 1988).. 17-18

Sinochem Int'l Co. v. Malaysia Int'l Shipping Corp., 549 U. S._ (2007) . 18

TABLE OF APPENDICES B

PAGE

Sosa v. Alvarez-Machain (03-339) 542 U.S. 692 (2004), 331 F.3d 604, reversed. 18-19

Steel Company v. Citizens For A Better Environment, 523 U.S. 83 (1998) ... 19

Swift v. Swift, 129 F.3d 792 (5th Cir. 1997) 20

Travelers Indemnity Company v. Gore, 761 F.2d 1549 (11th Cir. 1985) 21

TRW Inc. v. Andrews, 534 U.S. 19, 122 S.Ct. 441, 151 L.Ed.2d 339 (2001) 21- 23

United States v. Ratcliff, 488 F.3d 639 (5th Cir. 2007) 23

Woodruff v. Tomlin, 511 F.2d 1019 (6th 1975) 24

INTRODUCTION

THE PLAINTIFF HAS LEARNING DISABILITIES.

The plaintiff know this is NOT A PRETTY DOCUMENT, The PLAINTIFF does not have the $$$ MONEY in able to CREATING A GEM LIKE DOCUMENT as the COURT Deserves, but it is the best the PLAINTIFF can do with thy FINANCES AND DISABILITIES.

In the year 2000 accidentally stumbled upon the united States Securities and Exchange (sec) was "caught "

SELLING AND / OR GIVING AWAY
GOVERNMENT JOBS

To a regulatory agency.

In an effort to fight off any challenges to their decision hiring process they resorted to criminal activities (obstruction of justice, mail , wire fraud, perjury ..etc)

During a challenges by the plaintiff the SEC

INTENTIONALLY and / or WILLFULLY
VIOLATED THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

In an attempted to CRIMINALLY interfere with the filing of a lawsuit by a disable person, and caused the the DISABLED Plaintiff to miss the. DEADLINE TO FILE THE LAWSUIT BY SEVERAL DAYS

THE PLAINTIFF JAMES B .VEASAW was in the process of filing a lawsuit for Numerous NEFARIOUS ACTIVITIES that were taking place at the SEC and OTHER Federal, STATE, and FEDERALLY FUNDED COMPANIES.

THERE WERE ORIGINAL THREE CLASSES OF DEFENDANTS IN H-03-3878

FEDERAL,
STATE, AND
A FEDERALLY FUNDED COMPANY.

THE CASE H-03-3878 was FRAUDULENTLY DIVIDE INTO SIX (6) SUPPOSEDLY SEPARATE and INDEPENDENT LAWSUITS by THE COURT

==========

In the year 2000 at the height of the DOT-COM BOOM where almost any Computer specialist were having the PRIVILEGED PICK of just about any job they wanted. They were getting benefits such as someone doing their grocery shopping, picking up their dy cleaning , company car...etcNO ONE but RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES and people with disabilities were applying for government jobs.

NOTE: when the Plaintiff ask for a copy of the OTHER APPLICATIONS for the 3-4 jobs they tried to make it sound like it was ma mass of paper work; about 400 pages for 3-4 jobs. The plaintiff application was about 18- 20 pages in length.

Most of the jobs that the Plaintiff applied for at the U.S. S.E.C. couldn't have had at most 3-15 applying for any of the jobs they were posting.

SOME of THE HIGHER PAYING JOBS WERE NOT EVEN BEING POSTED FOR THE MINIMUM AMOUNT OF TIME (30 days), and SOME OF THOSE JOBS WERE PAYING OVER $100,000 each.

THE SEC said they were also keeping only the application of the people they INTERVIEWED, which was against Office of Personnel Management RULES. The was they were doing the process as far as any one could have guess was all the GREAT applicants were being throwing the trash as if they never existed, and the applications they were SELLING and/or GIVING AWAY the JOBS to were getting the interviews.

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from Federal Courts:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix 3A and APPENDIX 4A and the court record. and to the petition and (as far as the petitioner knows) is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States District court appears at Appendix 1A to the petition and and the court record. (as far as the petitioner knows) is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

ARTICLE III of the U.S. Constitution.

For cases from Federal Courts:

The date on which the United States DISTRICT Court DISMISSED case H-08-2936 with FINAL JUDGMENT was May 12, 2010.

The date on which the United States Fifth Circuit Court o f Appeal DENIED The Plaintiffs APPEAL was January 20 2010.

The date on which the United States Fifth Circuit Court o f Appeal DENIED MY REHEARING EN BANC was March 18, 2010.

The date on which the plaintiff filed thy Petition of Certiorari was on June 15, 2010, on which the Clerk office sent back the document giving the Plaintiff until August 20, 2010 (60 days) to put the Petition in the proper format.

And The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254, under Article 3 of teh U.S. Constitution.

1) This Court has Jurisdiction over plaintiffs' claims pursuant The Privacy Act , 5 U.S.C § 552a (g), and the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

(2) Venue is proper in this District pursuant to the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C § 552a (g)(5) and pursuant to the United States Code of Judicial Procedure 28 U.S.C. §1391. The remedies, procedures, and rights set forth in ,

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

==========

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION (as amended)
First Amendment, Fifth Amendment,
Ninth Amendment, Tenth Amendment,
Fourteenth Amendment
5 U.S.C § 552a (g)(1)
§ 2381. Treason
§ 2382. Misprision of treason
§ 2384. Seditious conspiracy
§ 2383. Rebellion or insurrection
§ 2385. Advocating overthrow of Government
§ 2441. War crimes.

UNITED STATES CODE
18 U.S.C. 1951,
(18 USC Sec. 371) Conspiring to commit offenses or defraud the United States,
(18 USC Sec. 1031) Major fraud against the United States,
(18 USC Sec. 1002) Possession of false papers to defraud United States,
(18 USC Sec 1341) Fraud and swindles (mail fraud) ,
(18 USC Sec 1343) Fraud by wire, radio, or television,
(18 USC Sec. 1510) Obstruction of criminal investigation.,
(18 USC Sec. 1505) Obstruction of proceedings before departments, agencies, and committees.,
(18 USC Sec. 1512) Tampering with a witness, victim, or informant.,
(18 USC Sec. 1621) Perjury Generally ,
(18 USC Sec. 3) Accessory after the fact.,
(18 USC Sec. 4) Misprision of a Felony.,
(18 U.S.C. Sec 1951 Sec 1961(1)) Racketeering.,
(18 USC Sec. 1952) Interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises. (distribution of proceeds).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

EVERY TIME I HAVE BEEN IN THESE HERE FEDERAL COURT I HAVE YET TO RECEIVE ONE DAY OF DUE PROCESS IN THE LAST 13 YEARS.

I AM ALWAYS RIGHT, THE LAW IS ALWAYS ON MY SIDE, YET I AM STILL DENIED DUE PROCESS.

FOR THE LAST 30 YEARS
The Courts have been MISINTERPRETING
THE PRIVACY ACT
5 U.S.C. § 552 (a) (g)(1) (5)

THE CRUCIAL WORD IS "EXCEPT"
In other words the plaintiff has 2 years after the ACCRUAL of DAMAGES to file their lawsuit.

IF for some reason the Plaintiff does not realize that damages have been INFLICTED AGAINST THEM, and the TWO YEARS form the VIOLATION ELAPSES.
Then, IF, WHEN, they find out that a PRIVACY ACT VIOLATION HAD INFLICTED HARM AGAINST THEM, then they have 2 years from that point of DISCOVERY.

COMPUTER VIRUS
NOTE TO THE CLERK AND COURT:
A VIRUS STUCK THE PLAINTIFF COMPUTER SYSTEM JUST PRIOR TO FINISHING THE ORIGINAL PETITION CERTIORARI , and the plaintiff had to Piece together PRINT OUTS to submit a brief and did not have the ORIGINAL FILE for the petition because it was deleted by the virus. The plaintiff had to take what ever text that was not deleted and re-draft the petition to the court.

ISSUES IN THIS CASE H-08-2936

==========

LAW WRITTEN WITH PARTICULAR WORDS THEY AS WERE WRITTEN

(DO A WORDS MEAN WHAT THEY MEAN?)

DISCRIMINATION (Every act a Cause of Action)

PRIVACY ACT

PRIVACY ACT REQUIREMENTS

- MUST HAVE DAMAGES
- MUST SHOW DAMAGES
- MUST MITIGATE DAMAGES
- STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS
  - (Statutes of limitations are triggered by INJURY)
- ACCRUAL RULE
  - CAUSE OF ACTION ACCRUAL
  - 1) Harm (vs. act) - start when the harm occurs, not when the harmful act occurs.
  - 2) When damages is done and you can quantify
    - a) WHO TO SUE?
    - and
    - b) THEIR LIABILITY?
- DISCOVERY RULE
  - 1) When relevant facts are discovered (or should be discovered by the reasonable person)

FRAUD (UP)ON THE COURT BY THE COURT

- STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

RICO / HOBBS ACT (CORRUPT GOVERNMENT)

TREASON

- 911
- OKLAHOMA CITY

MERITS / ACCOUNTABILITY

DEFECTIVE PLEADINGS

CASE H-08-2936 OUTLINE KEY POINTS
(CASE SUMMARY OF ISSUES)

1) H-03-3878(ORG EMPLOYMENT CASE)
2) 05-20312 (APPEAL TO THE 5TH CIR.)
3) 05-1467(PETITION U.S. SUPREME COURT)
4) H-08-2936(PRIVACY ACT CASE)
5) 09-20593 (APPEAL TO THE 5TH CIR.)
6) CASE 09- (PETITION U.S. SUPREME COURT)
7) BOTTOM LINE THE DISTRICT LEVEL
8) PLAINTIFF REBUTTAL
9) REBUTTAL OF H-09-2936 MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATIONS
10) THE EXTENT OF THE GOVERNMENT and COURTS CORRUPTION FRAUD (UP)ON THE COURT BY THE COURT
11) FRAUD(UP)ON THE COURT BY THE COURT 1
12) QUALIFICATIONS OF PLAINTIFF
13) THE 5TH CIRCUIT COURT LEVEL
14 FRAUD (UP)ON THE COURT BY THE COURT 2 SEPARATION and PROCESSING of H-08-3878
15) PRIVACY ACT WILLFULLY AND/OR INTENTIONALLY VIOLATION
16 CASE 05-1467 (Questions presented)
17) CASE 05-1467 v. 06-278
18 WITH A LITTLE 20/20 HIND SIGHT THE BANKRUPTCY OF AMERICA
19) TREASON
20) REASON FOR GRANTING WRIT
21) STARE DECISIS
22) CONCLUSION

KEY DATES

==========

1) CASE H-03-3878

(Org. employment discrimination case)

==========

Sept. 22, 2003	Date of filing	H-03-3878
Jan. 9, 2004	Date of FRAUDULENT separation of 1 to 6 into six lawsuits	H-03-3878 H-04-66 H-03-67 H-03-68 H-03-69 H-03-70
Dec. 17, 2004	Date of FRAUDULENT Memorandum and recommendations recorded	H-03-3878 H-04-66 H-03-67 H-03-68 H-03-69 H-03-70
Feb. 4, 2005	Date of FRAUDULENT Dismissal of	H-03-3878 H-04-66 H-03-67 H-03-68 H-03-69 H-03-70
Feb. 4, 2005	Date of Final Judgement	H-03-3878 H-04-66 H-03-67 H-03-68 H-03-69 H-03-70

2) CASE 05-20312 (Appeal from Previous case)

July 1, 2005 Appeal	H-03-3878
(the original case) to 5th Cir. Court	05-20312
Nov. 8, 2005 5th Cir. Appeal denied	05-20312

3) CASE 05-1467
(Petition to U.S. Supreme Court in previous case)

Feb. 4, 2005 Petition for writ of	
Certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court	05-1467
Oct. 2 2006 U.S. Supreme Court decided	
not to hear the plaintiff Petition of Certiorari	

BEGINNING the
STARTING DATE of 2 yr. statutes of limitations

Originally H-03-3878 had 3 defendants with LIABILITY for the case ,
FEDERAL AGENCIES
STATE OF TEXAS AGENCIES
FEDERAL SUPPORTED CORPORATION

H-03-3878 that was FRAUDULENTLY SEPARATED by the Court.

Case H-03-3878 was case appealed and taken to the U.S. Supreme Court.

NOTE STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS
October 2, 2006 to October 2, 2008 is exactly TWO YEARS and also NOTE It took a couple of days for the October 2, 2006 NOTICE from, the United States Supreme Court Clerks office a couple of days to reach me to inform me of MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
(ACCRUAL OF DAMAGES UNDER THE PRIVACY ACT.)

4) CASE H-08-2936 (CURRENT CASE)

==========

Oct. 2, 2008 Date for filing H-08-2936
Filed Within the 2 yr. of the statutes of limitations
Oct 2, 2006.

May. 12, 2009 Date of Memorandum and recommendations case H-08-2936
May. 12, 2009 Date of Final Judgment H-08-2936
July 7, 2009 Denial of a new trial H-08-2936
Sept. , 2009 NOTICE OF APPEAL H-08-2936

NOTE: Court Civil Docket records were tampered with claiming the judge dismissed the case the day before.

Aug. 31, 2009 Denial of 2nd new trial H-08-2936

5) CASE 09-20593 (5th Cir.) (CURRENT CASE)

==========

Sept. 1, 2009 Appeal case H-08-2936 to 5th Cir. Court 09-20593
Jan . 20 2010 5th Cir. Appeal denied 05-20312
Mar. 18 2010 5th Cir. denied rehearing EN BANC 05-20312

6) CASE 09- ? ? (U.S. Supreme Court – Petition))

==========

Jun. 15?, 2010 Petition for writ of Certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court
June 23, 2001 Clerk office returned Petition for failing to be in the proper format, orders it to be corrected and returned with 60 days.

AUGUST 2010 Prior to the CLERK APPOINTED dead line The plaintiff attempted to correct the deficiency in the plaintiffs petition.

7) BOTTOM LINE
THE DISTRICT LEVEL (CURRENT CASE)

==========

The Court dismissed H-08-2936 for TWO REASONS
1) STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS
2) CLAIM PRECLUSION (RES JUDICATA)

8) PLAINTIFF REBUTTAL

==========

Plaintiff statutes of limitations requirement was met by the plaintiff by filling the Privacy Act lawsuit within two years of DAMAGES ACCRUING (ACCRUED) .

Oct. 2, 2008 - Oct. 2, 2006 = 2 years

AND .....

THE DISTRICT COURT and DEFENSE
only has met ONE (1) of the four (4) REQUIREMENTS for RES-JUDICATA (the same defendant)

(i.e. The same government agency UNITED STATES SECURITIES and EXCHANGE COMMISSION)

They failed to meet their own (5th Cir.)
requirements for RES-JUDICATA

THOSE SAME SET of CRITERIA for
RES-JUDICATA they wrote themselves.
Nagle v. Lee, 807 F.2d 435, 439 (5th Cir. (1987)
APPENDIX B Page 12

FYI : (PLUS) The Previous court H-03-3878 ruled they did not have JURISDICTION Action over the CRIMINAL INTERFERENCE prior to the filing of H-03-3878.
SEE H-08-2936 USCA5-123 CASE NO H-08-2936

9) REBUTTAL OF H-09-2936
MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I . FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court was relying for their position was the SOME of the SAME FRAUD that the Plaintiff was SUING OVER. (WHERE IS DUE PROCESS?) (i.e. What the Plaintiff said was FRAUDULENT)

FRAUD IS FRAUD
UNTIL THERE IS SOME DUE PROCESS TO PROVE OTHERWISE

II. LEGAL STANDARDS

There are no legal standards in defense of FRAUD. IF FRAUD IS IN PART THEN THE FRAUD IS IN THE WHOLE, ACTION , DOCUMENT....etc

III. ANALYSIS

IMMEDIATELY THE COURT STARTS OFF BY THROWING INSULTS OVER THE PLAINTIFF LEARNING DISABILITIES,

"Plaintiffs complaint is far from a model of clarity. Broadly construed, Plaintiff raises a claim under the Privacy Act."
And
THEN CLAIMS TO INTERPRET FOR THE DISABLED PLAINTIFF . ! ?

The Plaintiff can PROVE thy case with about six (6) pieces of paper . ! ?

10) THE EXTENT OF THE
GOVERNMENT and COURTS CORRUPTION
FRAUD (UP)ON THE COURT BY THE COURT

A) SEC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MARIA SALACUSE RESIGNED and/or WAS REPLACED DURING MID-TRIAL with FRANCES DEL TORO.

B) SEC ATTORNEY EDWARD C. SCHWEITZER JR. COMMITTED AGGRAVATED PERJURY (OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE.....etc), and

C) DESTRUCTION and/or CONCEALING OF DOCUMENTS (OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE).

D) FRANCES DEL TORO COURT WAS ALSO DESTROYING DOCUMENTS (OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE)

and

WHEN IT WAS BROUGHT
TO THE ATTENTION OF THE COURT,
THAT THE COURT DIDN'T HAVE ALL THE PLAINTIFFS DOCUMENTS ,
THAT THE COURT WAS ATTEMPTING TO MAKE A DECISION WITH ONLY PARTIAL OF THE COURT DOCUMENT
(PLAINTIFFS DOCUMENTS WERE MISSING FROM THE COURT RECORD.),

and

THAT EDWARD C. SCHWEITZER JR HAD ATTEMPTED TO DESTROY (CONCEALED) ALL COPIES OF DISCOVERY DOCUMENTS and HAD COMMITTED PERJURY .

ADMINISTRATION LAW JUDGE FRANCES DEL TORO COVERED UP THE CRIMES BY FRAUDULENTLY MANUFACTURE A LIE (OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE), THAT THE PLAINTIFF DID NOT FILE WITHIN THE 45 DAY DEADLINE AND BY THEN DISMISSING THE CASE. Even when the documentation shoed other wise.

E) PLAINTIFF FILED LAWSUIT H-03-3878 UNDER THE HOBBS ACT (RICO) AFTER BEING HARASSED (OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE) BY THE DEFENDANT (U.S. SEC EMPLOYEES)

and

WAS ASSIGNED TO FEDERAL JUDGE JOHN D. RAINEY and FEDERAL JUDGE JOHN D. RAINEY WITHOUT MOTION ASSIGNED THE CASE TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE NANCY K. JOHNSON.

F) LAWSUIT H-03-3878 MAGISTRATE JUDGE NANCY K. JOHNSON COVERED UP THE CRIMES BY SEPARATING THE CASE IN A FRAUD ON COURT SCHEME AND THEN BY ISSUING MEMORANDUMS AND RECOMMENDATION FOR THE SAME DAY FOR SIX SUPPOSEDLY SEPARATE (INDEPENDENT) COURT CASES

and

NOT AS THEY WERE WRITTEN, but IN ORDER TO FORCE THE PLAINTIFF (with DOCUMENTED LEARNING DISABILITIES)

INTO A DEFAULT SITUATION ,

TO FORCE THE PLAINTIVE TO CHOOSE BETWEEN ONE and/or THE OTHER FIVE (5) CASES , BUT NOT ALLOWED ENOUGH TIME TO RESPOND TO ALL THE CASES.
(i.e the SEPARATED CASES FAILED TO BE INDEPENDENT OF EACH OTHER (The FRAUD)

G) FEDERAL JUDGE JOHN D. RAINEY DOES THE SAME AS MAGISTRATE JUDGE NANCY K. JOHNSON WHEN and HE IGNORES THE CRIMES COMMITTED AGAINST THE PLAINTIFF BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

AND

EVIDENCE OF THE CRIMES AND DISMISSES THE CASES.

H) 5 th APPELLATE COURT IGNORED THE CRIMES COMMITTED AGAINST THE PLAINTIFF BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, and COVERED UP BY THE JUDGES.

I) THE US SUPREME COURT IGNORED THE CRIMES COMMITTED AGAINST THE PLAINTIFF BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, and COVERED UP BY THE JUDGES.

J) AN NOW THAT THE PLAINTIFF COME BACK WITH A ROCK SOLID CASE UNDER THE PRIVACY ACT CASE (H-08-2936) AGAINST THE DEFENDANT AND YET ANOTHER CORRUPT COURT BEGINS TO MANUFACTURE MORE (and/or uses the previous) FRAUDULENT EVIDENCE AGAINST THE PLAINTIFF CASE.

11) FRAUD(UP)ON THE COURT BY THE COURT 1

==========

THE COURT SAID THE PLAINTIFF FAILED TO FILE WITHIN THE 45
DAY DEADLINE ESPECIALLY WITH THE

National Railroad Passenger Corporation v. Morgan., 536 U.S. 101 (2002)

APPENDIX B Page 13

EVERY ACTION OF DISCRIMINATION IS ACTIONABLE

All one needs to do is read the timeline of documents and conversations exchanged

See H-03-3878 USCA5-322 --- USCA5 324

THE PLAINTIFF MET THE 45 DAY DEADLINE
AND THE COURT COMMITTED FRAUD
AND
THE PLAINTIFF HAD EXHAUSTED ALL
ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS

12) QUALIFICATIONS OF PLAINTIFF

The Plaintiff applied for a GS 9 Positions at the U.S. SEC. All the sec had to do in the to put a quick end TO H-03-3878 LAWSUIT was to show that the PLAINTIFF was not the best qualified employee .

THE PLAINTIFF QUALIFICATION RATING WAS WITHIN
THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
QUALIFICATION RATING
(GS-12/GS-13),

See H-03-3878 USCA5-319 and USCA5 320.

13) THE 5TH CIRCUIT COURT LEVEL (ERRORS)

==========

The Case No. 09-20593 was dismissed because

> " The Appellant fail to address in his brief to this court any errors in the district court's opinion and orders dismissing appellant's suit. Accordingly, we grant the motion of appellees for summary affirmance.
> The Judgement of the district court is therefore AFFIRMED"

==========

HERE IS WHAT THE PLAINTIFF
WHAT PLAINTIFF SAID IN 09-20593 APPEAL

==========

" STATEMENT OF ISSUES

1) THE PLAINTIFF CASE (H-08-2936) WAS IMPROPERLY DISMISSED. THE COURT CLAIMS TO DISMISS FOR
   A) STATUES OF LIMITATIONS,
   B) RES JUDICATA

2) THE COURT IGNORES INFERENCES OF TREASON.

3) THE JUDGE DOES NOT QUALIFY or DISQUALIFY ON CLAIMS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY THE COURT IN HER DISTRICT."

==========

TO US (THE PEOPLE) THAT IMPLIES ERROR S WERE MADE BY THE COURT!

14) FRAUD (UP)ON THE COURT BY THE COURT 2 SEPARATION and PROCESSING of H-08-3878

==========

FROM O' CONNOR'S FEDERAL RULES (1997)

FRCP 42. CONSOLIDATED SEPARATED TRIALS
(Emphasis added)

(b) Separate Trials. The court, in furtherance of convenience or to avoid prejudice, or when separate trials will be conductive to expedition and economy may order of a separate trial of any claim, cross-claim, counterclaim, or third-party claim or of any separate issues or of any number of claims, cross-claims, counter, third party claims, or issues, always preserving inviolate the right of trial by jury as described by the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution or as given by a statute of the United States.

" the procedure authorized by Rule 42 (b) should be distinguished from severance under 21. Separate trials will unusually result in one judgment but severed claims become entirely

INDEPENDENT

action to be tried, and

judgement entered thereon,

INDEPENDENTLY.

At 305 " There is an important limitation on ordering a separate trial of issues under Rule 42(b):

the issue to be tried must be so

DISTINCT and SEPARATE

from other that a trial of it alone

MAY BE HAD WITHOUT INJUSTICE"...

This rule has an additional, pragmatic basis --- if two juries were allowed to pass on an issue involving the same factual and legal elements, the verdicts rendered by those juries could be inconsistent, producing intolerably anomalous results"

McDaniel v. Anheuser-Bush, Inc., 987 F.2d 298,304 n. 19 (5th Cir. 1993)

APPENDIX B Page 12

15) PRIVACY ACT A
WILLFULLY AND/OR INTENTIONALLY VIOLATION

THE SEC EMPLOYEE

WILLFULLY AND / OR INTENTIONALLY

VIOLATED THE PRIVACY ACT WHEN THEY TRIED TO

BACK DATE THE CONTRACT

HAVE THE CONTRACT INCLUDE AUGUST A DATE

BEFORE THE CONTRACT
WAS SIGNED AND APPROVED

IN ORDER TO
NEGATE THE PRIVACY ACT
VIOLATION

CONTACT by JDG Associates WAS BEGUN ON
09 / 9 / 03
And the CONTRACT for them to become a
SEC GOVERNMENT CONTRACTOR
under the AUTHORITY of the U.S. SEC wasn't sign and approved until
09 / 15 / 03 .

This nefarious activity of disseminating information about the plaintiff to a third party who was not at the time a government contractor caused unfairness, deniedthe plaintiff rights , opportunities and/or benefits ,and interfered with the plaintiff to filing case H-03-3878.

Subsequently that case was dismissed for being untimely.

16) CASE 05-1467 (Questions presented)

1) Are State and Federal Employees IMMUNE to commit CRIMES against the PEOPLE in order to GAIN the upper hand in a Court Case or Administrative investigation and/or Process , without any fear of RETRIBUTION in the COURTS?

2) Are FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS accessible by All Citizen for whom the programs were designed for, or are they just really WORK PROGRAMS designed to give CRONIES and BUREAUCRATS high paying Jobs?

3) Must the citizens of this country PASS LITERARY TESTS in order to receive PROTECTION in the COURTS (i.e. say the "MAGIC WORDS" for justice) (i.e. put the "MAGIC WORDS" on " MAGIC PAPER ")?

4) Are theses laws CONSTITUTIONAL, If these laws are not EQUALLY apply to ALL (STATE, FEDERAL, CORPORATE)?

5) I think (are) ALL of you ARE CORRUPT ?

6) CAN THE PETITIONER GET MORE JUSTICE WITH A $10 BOX OF AMMO, THAN WHAT CAN EVER BE FOUND IN ALL THE CORRUPT UNITED STATES COURT ROOMS.?

17) CASE 05-1467 v. 06-278 '(2006)

==========

WHY DID the court hear CASE No. 06-278

" BONGS FOR JESUS "

instead of CASE 05-1467

CORRUPT GOVERNMENT , CORRUPT COURTS,?

Was it because " BONGS FOR JESUS " was more important to everyone's lives than rather having to live with

CORRUPT GOVERNMENT , CORRUPT COURTS, ?

18) WITH A LITTLE 20/20 HIND SIGHT
THE BANKRUPTCY OF AMERICA

==========

SEEING OUR STOCK MARKET FALL SEVERAL TIMES, THE U.S. SEC WARNED ABOUT BERNIE MADOFF FOR DECADES, FREDDIE MAC, and FANNIE MAE, BAIL OUT OF BANKS, CAR MANUFACTURES ..etc...etc..etc.

AFTER HALF THE COUNTRY HAS LOST THEIR LIFE SAVINGS TO A BUNCH OF CRIMINALS, AND HARDLY A SINGLE PERSON HAS GONE TO JAIL FOR THE DAMAGE DONE TO THE COUNTRIES ECONOMY. NOT SUCH A WISE DECISION, YOU THINK MAYBE IT WOULD HAVE BEEN BETTER FOR THE COURT TO GO AFTER THE CRIMINAL IN OUR GOVERNMENT YOU THINK?
THE GOVERNMENT (The US SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION WAS SELLING AND/OR GIVING AWAY GOVERNMENT JOBS TO A REGULATORY AGENCY.

They had a hiring rate for the handicapped (disabled) of about . 01 % (less than 1 percent), while the national average for the population to be disabled is approximately 8 %. (A 800 percent deference.). The Hiring rate at the SEC reflect more of an agency who was hiring relatives (NEPOTISM) of MANAGERS who had disable children

TREASON

==========

I have told TRIED to tell many Judges about the EVIDENCE OF TREASON that took place on 9/11/2001 and at OKLAHOMA CITY.
NOT ONE JUDGE WILL HEAR WILL I HAVE TO SAY. AND THERE ARE NO PENALTY UNLESS YOU CAN COUNT AID AND COMFORT TO THE ENEMY AND/OR SEDITION.

18 U.S.C. § 2382. Misprision of treason

Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States and having knowledge of the commission of any treason against them, conceals and does not, as soon as may be, disclose and

make known the same to the President or to some judge of the United States,

, or to the governor or to some judge or justice of a particular State, is guilty of misprision of treason and shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than seven years, or both.

REASON FOR GRANTING WRIT

==========

Because I am right and I have
TAKEN THE CIVIL PATH TO SETTLE MY DISPUTES.
BECAUSE THE LAW IS ON MY SIDE
AND BECAUSE
THE LAW IS ALSO ON THE SIDE OF THE PEOPLE

STARE DECISIS

BASIS FOR OUR CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS
All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void.
Marbury v. Madison, 5 US (2 Cranch) 137, 174, 176, (1803).
APPENDIX B Page 11

BASIS FOR OUR CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS
Where right secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them.
Miranda v. Arizona, 384 US 436 p. 491.
APPENDIX B Page 11-12

BASIS FOR OUR CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS
16 AM Jur 2d, Sec 177 late 2d, Sec 256.
APPENDIX B Page 1

BASIS FOR OUR CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS
135 U.S. 1 In re Neagle [*]
APPENDIX B Page 1

PRIVACY ACT
Doe v. Chao, Secretary of Labor 540 U.S. 614 (2004)
APPENDIX B Page 5

PRIVACY ACT
Doe v. Chao, Secretary of Labor 435 F.3d 492 (4th Cir. 2006)
APPENDIX B Page 6

PRIVACY ACT
Doe v. Chao, Secretary of Labor 435 F.3d 492 (4th Cir. 2006)
APPENDIX B Page 6

PRIVACY ACT
Orekoya v. Mooney, 330 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2003)
APPENDIX B Page 14

MUST SHOW ACTUAL DAMAGES
(PRIVACY ACT)
Johnson v. Dept. of Treasury, 700 F.2d 971 (5th Cir. 1983)
APPENDIX B Page 11

Maydak v. United States, 363 F.3d 512 (DC Cir. 2004)
APPENDIX B Page 12

RES JUDICATA
Under federal law, an action is barred by the doctrine of res judicata if (1) the parties are identical or in privity in both the instant action and a prior action; (2) the prior judgment was rendered by a court of competent jurisdiction;
(3) the prior judgment was final on the merits; and
(4) the cases involve the same cause of action.
Nagle v. Lee , 807 F.2d 435, 439 (5th Cir. 1987).
APPENDIX B Page 12

CAUSE OF ACTION ACCRUAL
Clark v. Iowa City, 87 U.S. 20 Wall. 583 583 (1874)
APPENDIX B Page 3

CAUSE OF ACTION ACCRUAL
Bay Area Laundry And Dry Cleaning Pension Trust Fund v. Ferbar Corporation Of California, Inc. , 522 U.S. 192, 118 S.Ct. 542, 139 L.Ed.2d 553 (1997)
APPENDIX B Page 2

CAUSE OF ACTION ACCRUAL
Hodge v. Service Machine Company , 438 F.2d 347 (6th Cir 1971)
APPENDIX B Page 10

CAUSE OF ACTION ACCRUAL
Clay v. Johns-Manville Sales corp., 722 F.2d 1289 (6th Cir. 1983 -1984)
APPENDIX B Page 4

CAUSE OF ACTION ACCRUAL
Frame v. City of Arlington, No. 08-10630 (5th Cir. 2009)
APPENDIX B Page 7-8

FRAUD / FRAUD (UP)ON COURT
Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238, 64 S.Ct. 997, 88 L.Ed. 1250 (1944)
APPENDIX B Page 8

FRAUD / FRAUD (UP)ON COURT
Demjanjuk v. Petrovsky, 10 F.3d 338 (6th Cir. 1993)
APPENDIX B Page 5

FRAUD / FRAUD (UP)ON COURT
Herring v. United States of America., 424 F.3d 384 (3rd Cir. 2005)

APPENDIX B Page 9

DEFECTIVE PLEADING
Irwin v. Dept. of Veterans Affairs, 498 U.S. 89, 111 S.Ct. 453, 112 L.Ed.2d 435 (1990)

APPENDIX B Page 10-11

DISCRIMINATION
National Railroad Passenger Corporation v. Morgan., 536 U.S. 101 (2002)

APPENDIX B Page 13

FRAUD / FRAUD (UP)ON COURT
Rivet v. Regions Bank of Louisiana,522 U.S. 470, 118 S.Ct. 921, 139 L.Ed. 2d 913 (1998)

APPENDIX B Page 16-17

FRAUD / FRAUD (UP)ON COURT
Securities & Exchange Commission v. ESM Group, INC.,835 F.2d 270 (11th Cir. 1988)

APPENDIX B Page 17-18

MERITS / ACTIONABLE
Sinochem Int'l Co. v. Malaysia Int'l Shipping Corp., 549 U. S. (2007)

APPENDIX B Page 18

MERITS / ACTIONABLE
Steel Company v. Citizens For A Better Environment, 523 U.S. 83 (1998)

APPENDIX B Page 19

CAUSE OF ACTION / ACCRUAL
TRW Inc. v. Andrews, 534 U.S. 19, 122 S.Ct. 441, 151 L.Ed.2d 339 (2001)

APPENDIX B Page 21-23

DEFECTIVE PLEADING
Swift v. Swift, 129 F.3d 792 (5th Cir. 1997)

APPENDIX B Page 20

CAUSE OF ACTION / ACCRUAL MUST SHOW ACTUAL DAMAGES (PRIVACY ACT) DEFECTIVE PLEADING
Woodruff v. Tomlin, 511 F.2d 1019 (6th 1975)

APPENDIX B Page 24-25

CAUSE OF ACTION / ACCRUAL
DEFECTIVE PLEADING
Woodruff v. Tomlin, 511 F.2d 1019 (6th 1975)

APPENDIX B Page 24-25

BASIS FOR OUR CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS
An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; afford no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed.
Norton v. Shelby County 118 US 425 p.442.

APPENDIX B Page 13

FRAUD UPON THE COURT

Perjury and fabricated evidence are evils that can and should be exposed at trial, and the legal system encourages and expects litigants to root them out as early as possible.... Fraud on the court is therefore limited to the more egregious forms of subversion of the legal process, ... those we cannot necessarily expect to be exposed to by the normal adversary process. Great Coastal Express, 675 F.2d at 1357.

Travelers Indemnity Company v. Gore, 761 F.2d 1549 (11th Cir. 1985)

APPENDIX B Page 21

CONCLUSION

==========

REVERSE ALL THE LOWER COURTS ORDERS

PAY THE DEBT ON THE PRIVACY ACT VIOLATION,

THAT CAUSED THE ADVERSE AFFECT ON THE

PLAINTIFF,

(FOR AFFECTING THE PLAINTIFF HEALTH AND

CAUSING THE PLAINTIFF MISSING DEADLINE TO FILE)

ON THE PLAINTIFF CASE H-03-3878) TO THE PLAINTIFF

(PETITIONER)

PUT THE OK CITY, 9-11-2001...etc TRAITORS IN JAIL

Remember the H.M.S. HOOD,
Remember the U.S.S. ARIZONA.
SOLDIERS are DYING for this, what we call JUSTICE and FREEDOM (US Constitution) THE FREE WORLD.

EzeQiel-7

ELO = HEBREW (HE IS OVER)I CAN SEE , VERY CLEARLY THE THINGS WE HAVE CHANGED. ELO (He is over TIME)

TimeTA xTimeTA

In the hand of the Creator, Man Shall Travel through TIME

©

Fraud that prevents the functioning of the judicial process does not have to be brought within any specific period of time. See, e.g., Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238, 64 S.Ct. 997, 88 L.Ed. 1250 (1944); DeClaire v. Yohanan, 453 So.2d 375 (Fla.1984).

Securities & Exchange Commission v. ESM Group, INC., 835 F.2d 270 (11th Cir. 1988)

SIGNATURE



Signature of Plaintiff

James B. Veasaw ---------- Name of Plaintiff (Pro Se)
1511 Walnut Lane ---------- Address of plaintiff
Humble, Texas 77339 ------- City State Zip
(281) 358-3625 ---------- Telephone no.